



28 FEB 2006

#2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

NOVARTIS
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080

In re Application of BETZ et al	:	
U.S. Application No.: 10/520,568	:	
PCT Application No.: PCT/EP03/07349	:	
Int. Filing Date: 08 July 2003	:	DECISION
Priority Date Claimed: 09 July 2002	:	
Attorney Docket No.: BP/G-32575A/BCK	:	
For: LIQUID FORMULATIONS WITH HIGH	:	
CONCENTRATION OF HUMAN GROWTH	:	
HORMONE . . .	:	

This is in response to applicant's "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 17 February 2006.

BACKGROUND

On 08 July 2003, applicant filed international application PCT/EP03/07349, which claimed priority of an earlier United States application filed 09 July 2002. A copy of the international application was communicated to the USPTO from the International Bureau on 15 January 2004. The thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired on 09 January 2005.

On 07 January 2005, applicant filed national stage papers in the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US). The submission was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1).

On 25 July 2005, the DO/EO/US mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905), which indicated that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed.

On 16 December 2005, applicant filed a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

On 24 January 2006, this Office mailed a decision dismissing the 16 December 2005 petition.

On 17 February 2006, applicant filed the present renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) an oath or declaration by each applicant on his or her own behalf and on behalf of the nonsigning joint inventors, (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventors refuse to join in the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) the fee set forth in §1.17(i), and (4) the last known addresses of the nonsigning joint inventors.

Applicant has previously satisfied items (1), (3), and (4) above.

With regard to item (2) above, MPEP 409.03(d) states in relevant part,

Where a refusal to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of this refusal must be specified in an affidavit or declaration by the person to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Before a refusal can be alleged, it must be demonstrated that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the affidavit or declaration. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

The petition states that joint inventor Michael Betz refuses to sign the application papers. However, the petition does not adequately demonstrate that a bona fide attempt was made to present a complete copy of the application papers (including specification, claims, drawings, and oath/declaration) to Betz for signature. Although the petition states that Betz was provided with a copy of the present application, the reply letter from Betz mentions only declaration and assignment forms. As stated in the decision mailed 24 January 2006, a copy and translation of the original letter to Betz (i.e. the letter to which Betz responded to on 17 December 2004) has not been provided. If a copy of such letter cannot be obtained, then applicant should submit an affidavit from the person who sent the letter to Betz. Because it cannot be determined from the

presented evidence that Betz received all of the application papers, it would not be reasonable to conclude at the present time that Betz refuses to join in the application.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)". No additional petition fee is required.

Please direct further correspondence with respect to this matter to Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Bryan Tung
PCT Legal Examiner
PCT Legal Office

Telephone: 571-272-3303
Facsimile: 571-273-0459